

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 Nyles Lawayne Watson,

12 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-02-1777 DFL PAN P

13 vs.

14 State of California, et al.,

15 Defendants.

ORDER

16 _____/
17 On June 21, 2005, plaintiff filed a request for reconsideration of the magistrate
18 judge's order filed June 10, 2005, vacating the pretrial conference and trial dates in light of the
19 submitted motion for summary judgment. Pursuant to E.D. Local Rule 72-303(f), a magistrate
20 judge's orders shall be upheld unless "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Upon review of the
21 entire file, the court finds that it does not appear that the magistrate judge's ruling was clearly
22 erroneous or contrary to law. Plaintiff apparently misunderstands the June 10, 2005 order. That
23 order does not grant or decide defendants' motion for summary judgment; it submits the
24 summary judgment motion for future decision and vacates the pretrial conference and trial dates.
25 Those dates will be re-set if the summary judgment motion is denied.

26 Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon reconsideration, the order of the

1 magistrate judge filed June 10, 2005, is affirmed.

2 Dated: 6/30/2005

3
4 

5 DAVID F. LEVI
6 United States District Judge
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26